

Application No. 10/646,818  
Amendment dated March 10, 2008  
After Final Office Action of December 11, 2007

6

Docket No.: 69022(302753)

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-5 are pending in this application, of which claim 3 has been amended. Claims 1-2 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Singh et al. in view of Tomohisa et al. and Kojima et al. (all previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with regard to claims 3-5.

None of these references teaches, mentions or suggests selecting an irradiation shape combination corresponding to both the load adjustment amount and the angle adjustment amount, as in the instant application.

Accordingly, claim 3 has been amended to clarify this distinction.

None of these references teaches, mentions or suggests “an XY axis is set around the head mounting portion, an area I to an area IV are formed on the XY coordinates with the X axis as a gimbal longitudinal direction, and the laser beam irradiation area for correcting the angle in plus or the laser beam irradiation area for correcting the angle in minus is set in the area I and the area III or the area II and the area IV respectively”, as recited in claim 4.

None of these references teaches, mentions or suggests “a boundary is provided in a direction orthogonal with a gimbal longitudinal direction around the spring, a first area is formed at the head mounting side, a second area is formed at the opposite side, the laser beam irradiation area for correcting the pitch angle in plus is set in the first area, and the laser beam irradiation area for correction the pitch angle in minus in the second area” as recited in claim 5.

Although it is admitted that “assigning map regions or feature areas in the workpiece would have been obvious in order to easily identify locations for beam application,” as urged by the Examiner, none of the references teaches different laser beam irradiation areas for correcting pitch “in plus” and “in minus,” respectively, as recited in the claims of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn with regard to claims 3-5, as amended.

DC 239079.1

Application No. 10/646,818  
Amendment dated March 10, 2008  
After Final Office Action of December 11, 2007

7

Docket No.: 69022(302753)

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "APA") in view of Singh et al., Tomohisa et al., Kojima et al. and Dufresne et al. (all previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with regard to claims 3-5.

Dufresne et al. has been cited for teaching "the precise pattern needed" for the laser beam but, like the other references cited by the Examiner, fails to teach, mention or suggest "selecting an irradiation shape combination corresponding to the proposed amendments to both the load adjustment amount and the angle adjustment amount," as recited in claim 3.

Furthermore, like the other cited references, Dufresne et al. fails to teach, mention or suggest the feature of claims 4-5 with regard to different laser beam irradiation areas for correcting pitch "in plus" and "in minus," respectively, as recited in these claims.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 3-5, as amended, are in condition for further examination.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: March 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By William L. Brooks

William L. Brooks

Registration No.: 34,129  
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, Massachusetts 02205  
(202) 478-7370  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

DC 239079.1